

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11, 14-16, 18, 21, 24, 26-29 and 31-34 remain pending in the application, claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 30 being canceled herein.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 over Tverskoy

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,160 to Tverskoy et al. ("Tverskoy"). Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 22 and 23 are canceled herein, making the rejection of those claims now moot. With respect to claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 21, 24, 26 and 28, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14 and 15 recite a processor adapted to NOT store Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the relevant incoming call is not answered. Claims 21, 24, 26 and 28 recite a step of determining to NOT store received Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the relevant incoming call is not answered.

The Examiner cites primarily col. 3, lines 40 to 43 as allegedly disclosing that "caller id information is **only** stored when the call is answered by the answering machine". (Office Action at 3)(emphasis added) Tverskoy states in this ONLY passage relevant to Caller ID data: "However, at the user's option, control system 26 **may** store caller identification information from all incoming calls in digital memory 22, even if a caller hangs up without leaving a message."

"May" store is not "only" store, as read into by the Examiner.

Nevertheless, Tverskoy is not speaking of Caller ID memory in this passage at col. 3, but rather is discussing a regurgitation of a voice message into compressed memory in preparation for configuring an EMAIL message containing the voice message (which is the point of Tverskoy's invention). In other words, Tverskoy's machine STORES ALL Caller ID information into Caller ID memory upon receipt. It is later, upon preparation of a suitable email message containing the voice message to provide a remote notification of the

message that Tverskoy picks and chooses data that is included in the remote email message.

Tverskoy fails to disclose NOT storing Caller ID information into Caller ID memory, as claimed by ALL pending claims of the present application.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 21, 24, 26 and 28 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 over Tverskoy in view of Hirai

In the Office Action, claims 6, 16 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tverskoy in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,446,785 to Hirai ("Hirai"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21. In particular, claims 6 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to NOT store Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the incoming call is answered. Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, determining to NOT store Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the call is answered.

Neither Tverskoy nor Hirai disclose, teach or suggest NOT storing Caller ID information into Caller ID memory, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 16 and 27 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10, 17-20 and 29-34 over Tverskoy in view of Lim

In the Office Action, claims 7-10, 17-20 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tverskoy in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,883,942 to Lim et al. ("Lim"). Claims 7, 9, 10, 17, 19, 20 and 30 are canceled herein, making the rejection with respect to those claims now moot. With respect to claims 8, 18, 29 and 31-34, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 8, 18, 29 and 31-34 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21. In particular, claims 8 and 18 recite a processor adapted to NOT store Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the incoming call is answered. Claims 29 and 31-34 recite, *inter alia*, determining to NOT store Caller ID data into Caller ID memory if the call is answered.

Lim appears to disclose a caller-ID device and/or an integrated caller ID and answering machine device which is configurable (Abstract). When the caller ID device receives an incoming call, it shows caller ID information for an incoming call on a display unit (Lim, col. 6, lines 14-17). At the same time, the caller ID device stores the caller ID information of the incoming call in a caller ID memory area of a data storage unit for later access and review by a user (Lim, col. 6, lines 20-23).

Lim discloses caller ID information is stored for each incoming call. Lim fails to teach NOT storing caller ID data for any reason, much less when a call is answered as claimed by claims 8, 18, 29 and 31-34.

Neither Tverskoy nor Lim, either alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest NOT storing caller ID data for any reason, much less when a call is answered as claimed by claims 8, 18, 29 and 31-34.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 8, 18, 29 and 31-34 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336